Report 6

3283

18 December 1998

Jon Smets
Team Coach for
Silos Project Engineering
Fluor Daniel Fernald
PO Box 538704
Cincinatti, Ohio 45253-8704

Dear Jon:

Attached is the CAT report from our Silos Project integration overview conducted in December. Our comments based on this brief review are aimed at FDF achieving a more focused and structured project management infrastructure. If such a structure is implemented, it will allow FDF to a better chance at meeting the considerable management challenges posed by the Silos Project.

Sincerely,

Todd Martin
CAT Leader

cc: R.C. Roal
G.E. Bingham

Critical Analysis Team Report on Overall Silos Project Issues

18 December 1998

The CAT has developed a body of advice on the importance of management infrastruture and Fernald's ability to successfully manage the program. After several months of reviewing FDF's procurement processes for Silo 3 treatment, Accelerated Waste Retrieval, and Silos 1 and 2 remediation, the CAT briefly reviewed the entire Silos project from a higher level. Following are the CAT comments from this review.

In summary, the project needs to become more structured, with closely controlled decision-making authority, lines of communication, procedures and policies. The procedures and policies need to clearly outline the project's expectations for project managers and project management, and assure commonality among the three silos project efforts.

- The Silos project appears to lack a clear definition of roles, responsibilities, authorities and interfaces. Silos project management need to agree upon an acceptable, standard project organization and define roles, responsibliities, authority and interfaces for each management position.

- Portions of the Silos Project are apparently already planning for Operational Readiness Review. In addition, procedures, policies, documentation, and staffing are being developed to support the project. These are positive first steps toward project success. But they are only first steps -- comprehensive project procedures need to be prepared, approved, issued and enforced on the following issues:

    - Configuration Management including change control, reporting and vendor data (submittal controls).

    - Records Management with special emphasis on design reviews.

- Silos project personnel need to be trained in the project procedures to assure implementation.

- The project should convene a change board at the project level to review and approve all proposed changes. This is important to ensure buy-in from other site organizations, develop a unified project position, and avoid second-guessing.

- Each project manager within the Silos project should be provided with a project contingency budget. However, use of contingency funds should be based on approved change requests.

- Communication, coordination and cooperation on the silos project is essential. Silos projects should maximize the experiences and work of each other (e.g. lessons learned, project documentattion, processess, studies, etc.) Further, work should be coordinated to ensure that duplication of work effort is not taking place within the project.

- The vendor data review and approval process is vital to the success of the project. Immediate attention should be paid to the process, policies,personnel, review teams, comment forms,

documentation, resolution and documenting comments, and control, storage and retrieval of documentation.

- FDF should organize weekly staff meetings of project senior management to coordinate Silos project activities.

- The bureaucratic burden of the Record of Decision Amendment process delays the schedule for Silos 1 and 2 remediation. FDF, DOE and EPA should aggressively investigate and consider opportunities for streamlining the decision process (e.g. design of silo 1 and 2 remediation facility design in parallel with ROD process.) While this increases programmatic risk for all parties, the opportunity should at least be investigated. Any such effort would have to be accompanied by aggressive and substantive public involvement.

- One requirement of any project is strong, dedicated, involved management. This is particu larly important in this project given the integration needs of multiple contracts.

- Project schedules should be user friendly -- the schedules the CAT reviewed were too com plicated. The schedules were not laid out in a clear logic or in chronological order. Rather, the schedules were a random accumulation of activities. The top level schedule does not relate directly to the first level through WBS or any apparent numbering system. It is impossile to detect critical path for the project (if one exists). Lastly, the schedule the CAT received was not complete. The complete schedule is needed to complete the CAT analyses (particularly for expediting ROD schedule).

- Preparation is the key to successful review processes. The lead people and their teams that will fully support the review and response to deliverables must be identified now. Analyses must be done to ensure appropriate skill mix, experiences and numbers of personnel.

- Resource loadings by discipline are necessary in order to adequately review document submittals from the vendors. If FDF and others don't staff up to meet the review require ments it will be costly and delay the program. This must be done in each review area (e.g. engineering, safety, quality assurance, operations, maintenance, etc.) internally as well as externally (e.g. DOE Ohio, DOE Headquarters, US EPA, etc).

- An internal quality assurance group should periodically (and randomly) audit the Silos project to assure budget, schedule, cost and scope authorization and control.

R.C. Roal

G.E. Bingham

T.M. Martin